



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 7, 2013

Ms. Lisa D. Mares
Counsel for the City of Southlake
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam LLP
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2013-00295

Dear Ms. Mares:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 475444.

The City of Southlake (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all disciplinary files, statements, F-5 forms, and time sheets during a specified time period for a named former officer of the city's police department. You state the city will redact social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You state the city is making some of the requested information available to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.151 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information because it was created after the city received the request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

¹Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, which reads as follows:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). You contend portions of the responsive information constitute law enforcement records of a child that are confidential pursuant to section 58.007(c). For purposes of section 58.007(c), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Upon review, we find some of the information at issue consists of law enforcement records of a child that involves delinquent conduct that occurred after September 1, 1997. *See id.* § 51.03 (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of Fam. Code § 58.007). It does not appear any of the exceptions in section 58.007 apply. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. However, we note records of an internal investigation do not constitute juvenile law enforcement records for purposes of section 58.007(c). Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information at issue consists of juvenile law enforcement records for purposes of section 58.007(c), and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002)*. First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made

“for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. See TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. See *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. See TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. See *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. See *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state the responsive information submitted as Exhibit B-2 consists of communications involving a city attorney and city employees in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state these communications were confidential, and you do not indicate the city has waived the confidentiality of the information at issue. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information in Exhibit B-2. Accordingly, the city may withhold the responsive information in Exhibit B-2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information at issue. See *id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); see also *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to the records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in

nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). However, you represent the information submitted as Exhibits C-1 and C-2 relates to a pending criminal arson investigation. Based upon your representation, we conclude release of the information at issue will interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Accordingly, we find the city may withhold Exhibits C-1 and C-2 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). As noted above, section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth*, 86 S.W.3d 320, *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525-26. You state some of the submitted documents “include information gathered pursuant to investigations that resulted in an outcome other than conviction or deferred adjudication.” The remaining information at issue consists of internal affairs investigations that are purely administrative in nature. You do not state the internal affairs investigations resulted in criminal investigations. Therefore, we find you have not demonstrated how any of the information at issue pertains to a criminal investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(2) to any portion of the information at issue, and none of the information may be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See* Gov't Code § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it

²As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining arguments under sections 552.108(b)(1) and 552.151 of the Government Code against its disclosure.

generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code* § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. We note section 411.083 does not apply to active warrant information or other information relating to one's current involvement with the criminal justice system. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system). Further, CHRI does not include driving record information. *See id.* § 411.082(2)(B). Upon review, we find a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked, consists of confidential CHRI. Thus, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. The type of information considered intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has found some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision Nos.* 455 (1987) (information pertaining to prescription drugs, specific illnesses, operations and procedures, and physical disabilities protected from disclosure), 422 (1984), 343 (1982). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision Nos.* 600 (1992), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). Further, this office has determined common-law privacy generally protects the identities of juvenile offenders. *See Open Records Decision No.* 394 (1983); *cf. Fam. Code* § 58.007(c). Upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

However, we find you have not demonstrated how the remaining information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a), and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The Supreme Court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Having carefully reviewed the information at issue, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

We note the remaining information contains motor vehicle record information that is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code and e-mail addresses that are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See Gov’t Code § 552.130*. You state the city will redact Texas driver’s license numbers and Texas license plate numbers pursuant to the previous determination issued in Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), and will redact driver’s license and personal identification information under

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987)*.

section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.⁴ The city must also withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. The city may withhold the responsive information in Exhibit B-2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibits C-1 and C-2 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code, and the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The city must release the remaining responsive information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free,

⁴Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including Texas driver’s license numbers, a photocopy of a Texas driver’s license, and Texas license plate numbers under section 552.130(a)(2) of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. However, the Texas legislature has amended section 552.130 to allow a governmental body to redact the information described in subsections 552.130(a)(1) and (a)(3) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Thus, the statutory amendments to section 552.130 of the Government Code supercede Open Records Decision No. 684 with respect to Texas driver’s license numbers and a photocopy of a Texas driver’s license. Therefore, a governmental body may redact information subject to subsections 552.130(a)(1) and (a)(3) only in accordance with section 552.130, not Open Records Decision No. 684.

at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Claire Morris Sloan". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish at the end.

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 475444

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)